

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-15, and 17-19 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 11, 13, and 17 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 5, 9-10, and 16 have been canceled. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-15, and 17-19 are now pending in this application.

Objections To Informalities to the Claims

The Examiner has pointed out that Claim 10 fails to further limit the invention with respect to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 10 is cancelled without prejudice.

Additionally, the Examiner has pointed out that Claim 17 depends upon a previously cancelled claim. Accordingly, Claim 17 is amended to depend from 13. Consequently, the objections to Claims 10 and 17-19 have been addressed and the applicants request that the objections to Claims 10 and 17-19 be withdrawn.

Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Written Description Requirement

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-15, and 17-19 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action contends that there is no foundation for a row-based analysis capable of analyzing frames based on a composite row analysis of the frames collected by a sensor. Applicants respectfully disagree, the row based analysis of a composite image generated by a single sensor is precisely what is depicted by arrow 810 of Fig. 10 which depicts a line of data frames 802 being compared. This is supported by the specification at the bottom paragraph of page 18 and the top paragraph of page 19. Moreover, this is but one of the possible permutations supported by the specification. This distinction has been clarified by the amendments to Claims 1 and 13 which clarify that such analysis is a "row based analysis". This is well supported by the Specification. This analysis can be enhanced by incorporating multiple sensors and/or multiple device areas if desired (e.g., claims 6, 7, 8, . It is respectfully submitted that the specification supports the claimed limitations. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that this grounds of rejection be withdrawn as to the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-15, and 17-19 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Kulkarni et al.* (USPN 6,020,262) (hereinafter *Kulkarni*) in view of *Dor et al.* (USPN 6,701,259) (hereinafter *Dor*) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Although the *Dor* and *Kulkarni* references are defective several grounds, the applicants point out with specificity that the cited references fail to teach "transmitting the data frames from each detector to a data distribution node, which is part of a set of data distribution nodes that are interconnected with crossbar connections that enable data collected by any of the plurality of detectors to be transferred to any of the data distribution nodes" (e.g., as in Claim 1). None of the cited references teach crossbar connections between nodes that enable data to be directed to any detector. This same limitation applies to Claim 13, which teaches the same limitation in a method format.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to Claims 1 and 13. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this ground for rejecting Claims 1 and 13 be withdrawn. Additionally, applicants reiterate that Claim 10 is cancelled.

It is submitted that the cited references, alone or in any combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 1 or 13. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1 and 13 are patentably distinct from the cited references. It is submitted that dependent claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-15, and 17-19 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for their corresponding independent claims. The additional limitations recited in the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, and 17-19.

SUMMARY

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable and that this case is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to contact the undersigned for any reason, the telephone number set out below can be used.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. KLA1P095).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Francis T. Kalinski II
Registration No. 44,177

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Telephone: (650) 961-8300